

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80812
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Oral Health And Associated Factors In Patients With Various Psychiatric Disorders In Indian Population
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>This paper shows the relationship between oral diseases and mental disorders. The content is very interesting, but the research has not yet been carried out, and it is thought that it is the content of the introduction of the research design and the summary of the previous reports. It is unclear what kind of manuscript the submitted magazine will publish, but if you think about it normally, it will either be summarized as a review or your results will be published as an original paper. Since the current manuscript is neither of them, it seems necessary to consider whether it is necessary to change the appearance drastically at the discretion of the editorial board.</p> <p>In case the examination proceeds as it is, I will point out the details just in case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The content of Results in Abstract is too small. The results should be shown even in a straightforward manner.</li> <li>- Isn't Expected Results unnecessary? (It seems that only the subjectivity of the author can be written)</li> </ul>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The content (Every ...) written at the end of the Background of Abstract is not the background content.</li> <li>- I don't understand why the target is 22 years old or older (if there are circumstances peculiar to India, it is better to write it).</li> </ul>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If terms such as Background and Objectives used in the abstract are duplicated in the text, the text may be difficult to understand.</li> <li>- There seems to be a flaw in the insertion of the bibliography number.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jun Kobayashi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Kochi, Japan</b>